DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 721 HE 014 356

AUTHOR Smyth, D. McCormack
TITLE The End of Universities in Canada.
PUB DATE 4 Jun 81
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented to the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education at the Conference of the Learned Societies (Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia, June 4, 1981).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Role; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Financial Support; Foreign Countries; *Higher Education; Institutional Characteristics; Political Influences; Religious Education; Sciences; Unions; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS *Canada; McGill University (Canada); McMaster University (Canada); Queens University of Kingston (Canada); University of Western Ontario (Canada)

ABSTRACT

Recent Canadian English language literature on the history and philosophy of higher education in Canada is reviewed to assess the prospects for survival for Canadian universities. Additionally, suggestions for revitalizing higher learning in Canada are offered. Among the topics that are addressed are the following: McMaster University and the homogenizing process in Canadian higher education, Queen's University and its maintenance of uniqueness, the University of Western Ontario and the emergence of Canadian multiversities; McGill University and perplexing problems in Canadian higher education; the goals of Canadian universities; the confused canons of the Canadian academy; competing conceptions of the university; the changing ideas of the Canadian Association of University Teachers; the reasons for the earlier survival of universities; the university and the struggle between the cooperative conception of human life and the authoritarian conception; the place of liberal intellectuals in the contemporary crisis of the university; the university and money; dominant features and some shortcomings of recent writing on higher education in Canada; clarifying the nature of what Canadian universities are and what they could become; sources of the shortcomings of contemporary universities; and signs of hope in contemporary academic life in Canada. The review of scholarly works on Canadian higher education includes general historical works, individual accounts, and institutional histories. A bibliography is appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208721

For release:
9 A.M.
4 June 1981

THE END OF UNIVERSITIES IN CANADA

A paper presented
to

The Canadian Society
for
The Study of Higher Education

at
The Conference
of
The Learned Societies

Dalhousie University,
Halifax, Nova Scotia

4 June 1981

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE 014 358

by

© D. McCormack Smyth
Professor of Administration
York University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Overview of Recent Canadian Scholarly Writing on the History and Philosophy of Higher Education	
General Historical Works	3
Individual Accounts	5
Institutional Histories	7
McMaster and the Homogenizing Process in Canadian Higher Education	8
Queen's University and Its Maintenance of Uniqueness	10
The University of Western Ontario and the Emergence of Canadian Multiversities	11
McGill and Perplexing Problems in Canadian Higher Education	
The Goals of Canadian Universities	14
The Confused Canons of the Canadian Academy	14
Competing Conceptions of the University	16
The Changing Ideas of the Canadian Association of University Teachers	17
The Reasons for the Earlier Survival of Universities	19
The University and the Struggle Between the Cooperative Conception of Human Life and the Authoritarian Conception	20
The Place of Liberal Intellectuals in the Contemporary Crisis of the University	21
The University and Money	22
Dominant Features and Some Shortcomings of Recent Writing on Higher Education in Canada	25
Clarifying the Nature of What Canadian Universities Are and What They Could Become	25
Sources of the Shortcomings of Contemporary Universities	27
Signs of Hope in Contemporary Academic Life in Canada	30
Conclusion	33
Footnotes	34

THE END OF UNIVERSITIES IN CANADA

> An overview of the purposes and present predicament of Canadian universities, and their future prospects, as reflected in recent scholarly writing on historical and philosophical aspects of higher education in Canada.

In a stimulating article in the Toronto Globe and Mail of 28 April 1980 George Grant discussed research and teaching in Canadian universities. He concluded the article with this observation:

> Never has so much money been spent on the organized study of the past, and never has the past had less meaning in shaping the real life of our present. ... technological excellence plus museum scholarship are not enough. When they are considered sufficient the mass of students will become listless. Scholarship is a means to thought, not a substitute for it.[1]

Grant's conclusions merit serious reflection and should stimulate those interested in Canadian universities to in-depth thought, concerning the essential purposes of institutions of higher learning, and informed action toward their revitalization.

How has it happened that universities, having survived the violence of the late 1960's and early 1970's, with budgets and numbers of faculty members at their highest levels in history, now find themselves in deepening trouble? There are no simple answers to that question. Obviously their troubles are reflected in their financial and organizational predicament. But this is not the root of the problem. Similarly the primary root of the difficulties engulfing our universities is not to be traced simply to the emergence of the new oral and visual culture of the electric age although this is a contributing factor.

The widening neglect of the high literacy has had major consequences for higher learning just as the invention of unitized type and the printing press fostered the production of books which encouraged interest in such learning and made its democratisation possible. The rising sea of largely uncoordinated information and the bewildering pace and complexity of human experience, fostered by multi-dimensional specialization and declining commitment to precise thought and speech, are on the verge of swamping the human spirit and have already seriously eroded the foundations of higher learning in the West.

In recent years unprecedented numbers of articles and monographs have been published on the history and current problems of higher education in Canada. Many of these are of high quality. My impression, however, is that little of this valuable material is being absorbed, and less is being acted upon by those well situated to contribute to the essential reforms in Canadian academic life. This is a profound tragedy.

> Next to the death of the planet from atomic war or pollution, the most important problem of our time is the crisis of the university. For it is the nature of the university, and the role it plays in any particular society, which gives that society its quality and direction.[2]

The crisis of the university appears to be deepening year by year in Canada for a number of reasons:

1. Obvious sources of dis-ease in academic life have been allowed to go unattended or have been treated inadequately.
2. Universities have undertaken a range of responsibilities which are beyond their strength to do well.
3. The structures and processes of government and adjudication, which the unique nature of universities require, have not been incorporated into academic life as higher education has been expanded.
4. In many universities adversarialism is accepted as the essential way of life. There is lack of agreement on the purposes of higher learning. A sense of cohesion through shared objectives does not prevail to the extent required for universities to function effectively as centres for such learning.

In our time few of the members of the university are devoting their primary efforts to the needs of the university in these critical areas. Most are preoccupied with particular problems, their own special interests and needs. Those charged with the overall well-being of the university are often so preoccupied with immediate problems that they have little if any time to attend to the big issues. This point was made early in the 1960's by the late Herbert Butterfield, then Vice-Chancellor of the University of Cambridge. In his address on his retirement from that office he noted that institutions of higher education are caught up in a tidal wave of change.

> At such a moment either somebody has to be really creative or the system just slides farther down an inclined plane. Mere mechanical adjustments to get us round a corner (and too great an obsession with problems of number and organization) generally mean a neat brush-off in respect of all issues concerning quality.[3]

The situation appears to have become increasingly grave in Britain, Canada and the rest of the free world since Professor Butterfield made those observations two decades ago.

In this paper I shall explore recent scholarly writing on the history and philosophy of higher education in Canada to determine whether there are grounds for concluding that universities in Canada will survive their present ordeal and emerge strengthened, or whether they will gradually decline and, like monasteries, which were centres of primary significance in the Middle Ages, become institutions of dwindling social influence.

The question to which I direct attention then is: Are we witnessing the gradual demise of the university as a centre for higher learning in Canada or are there firm grounds for assuming that there is light at the end of the tunnel of travail in which the university now finds itself?

Overview of Recent Canadian Scholarly Writing on the History and Philosophy of Higher Education

In this survey of scholarly writing on Canadian academic affairs I shall not engage in what Abraham Maslow has described as "rubricizing."[4] I shall not shuffle over past experiences, habits and knowledge to determine how the present resembles or differs from the past. This report will not take the form of a bibliographic essay. Happily Professor Robin Harris and his associates have already brought together the materials for a new supplement to the earlier Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada.[5]

I shall provide in this paper a brief overview of English language scholarly writings in a limited number of areas. Then I shall set out my assessment of the dominant features and shortcomings as I perceive them, of historical and philosophical writing, during the last decade, on Canadian academic affairs. Some of the sources of the shortcomings, reflected in such writing, will be reviewed and signs of hope will be noted. I shall conclude with some brief observations on the action which I judge is essential on the part of those committed to the revitalization of higher learning in Canada.

General Historical Works

A major turning point was reached in the history of scholarship concerning Canadian higher education with the publication in 1976 of Robin Harris's monumental volume A History of Higher Education in Canada 1663-1960.[6]

The writing of this volume and its publication signalled the coming of age of the scholarly study of higher education in Canada. This work by Professor Harris is of singular value in Canadian academic life for the historical perspective and insights it makes available to those who wish to understand the intellectual origins and development of higher learning in Canada. This landmark volume does not deal with academic constitutions or government of Canadian universities or extra-curricular matters. Rather its focus is on the curricula of Canadian universities as they have evolved. As a result Canadians now have information on the intellectual and institutional roots of higher learning in their own land.

Five years prior to the publication of Harris's primary work, another key event in the history of educational publishing in Canada occurred with the appearance of L. K. Shook's volume Catholic Post-Secondary Education in English Speaking Canada.[7] This monograph, by virtue of its subject matter does not cover as wide a range of interests as those treated by Harris. It provides, however, detailed historical information on the life and work of thirty-two English language Catholic colleges and universities in a skilful and insightful manner. Like Harris's volume, that of Shook reflects scholarly excellence of the first order.

Other notable works, of a comprehensive nature, which merit more detailed comment than can be provided here include the Symons report[8] on Canadian studies, a document of significant historical importance in the development of this strategic field of study. Mention must also be made of the encyclopaedic works on educational developments in Ontario by the late Dr. W. G. Fleming, the memory of whose broad interests and scholarly vigour continues to stimulate those who knew him.[9] On the international level is Murray G. Ross's thoughtful volume The University: The Anatomy of Academe which provides a review of the historical evolution of the university, analyzes the sources of recent difficulties and suggests how its revitalization might be achieved.[10]

Among recent doctoral theses on topics of special interest to scholars concerned with Canadian higher education are Gwen Pilkington's "A History of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1911-1961"[11] and R. M. Gill's "Universities and Development in Quebec."[12] The first was presented at Toronto in 1974 and the second at Duke University in the United States in 1976. These are only two of a considerable variety of valuable research reports on Canadian higher education which have increased substantially in number since the appointment of Robin Harris as Canada's first Professor of Higher Education in 1964.

Individual Accounts

Over the last decade Canadian academic life has been enriched by a wide variety of stimulating articles and monographs dealing with intellectual issues and developments from the perspective of individual observers. Here I shall mention four.

Claude Bissell's personal account of life as he experienced it in the University of Toronto from 1932-1971, Halfway up Parnassus[13] is one of the most graceful and insightful accounts of academic life which I have been privileged to read. This volume is unsurpassed in its discernment and refreshing openness, its careful analysis and non-concealment of the weak points of administration during the most tumultuous period in Canadian academic history.

In his volume Second Thoughts: Science, the Arts and the Spirit[14] the late Wilder Penfield dealt in a most thoughtful and engaging manner with key issues which merit in-depth reflection by those engaged day by day in scholarly and scientific pursuits. Penfield examined matters of supreme importance in his discussion of the connections among science, the arts and the spirit. As a neurosurgeon he reported that in all his studies:

> No mechanism has been discovered that can force the mind to think, or the individual to believe, anything. The mind continues free. This is a statement I have long considered. I have made every effort to disprove it, without success. The mind, I must conclude, is something more than a mechanism. It is, in a certain sense, above and beyond the brain, although it seems to depend upon brain action for its very existence. Yet it is free.[15]

This comes as an illuminating and encouraging word to those whose commitment is to higher learning in its fullest and most comprehensive sense in an age when many assumed that human beings are merely sophisticated mechanisms.

Penfield's argument, that authority within the university must be based "not on numbers or the rule of the majority, but on knowledge"[16] is in keeping with classical concepts of the university. In the contemporary climate of majority opinion in Canadian academic life this argument in all likelihood would not gain wide support as a primary principle of university government among most senior members of Canadian universities given the prevailing adversarial winds. On the other hand one has good reason to believe that a majority of Canadian academics would agree that in principle the government of centres of higher learning must be based on the authority of knowledge.

In his article "The Superiority of the Bilingual Brain"[17] Penfield provides highly instructive information eminently worthy of much wider dissemination, particularly in Canada, than it has thus far enjoyed. That it has not received the attention and action it deserves has been a major, if unknown, loss to all Canadians.

In 1970, the year in which Wilder Penfield's work Second Thoughts appeared, a volume of addresses delivered between 1961 and 1969 by Principal J. A. Corry of Queen's University was published.[18] The papers included in that volume give ample evidence of why Professor Corry is revered not only by his students and colleagues but throughout Canada and beyond. His conviction that, if universities are to survive, the primacy of the teaching-learning process and the continuing involvement of all faculty members in that process must be made operative, appears to be gaining support once again. Similarly there is widespread agreement in Canada that the Federal Government has a major role to play in the advancement of the higher learning of its people. In this regard Professor Corry wisely observed:

> Is it not strange that numbers of those who warn us of the critical bilingual needs should in almost the same breath be saying that the Government of Canada has no role to play in education.

Thus he argued that the Parliament and Government of Canada must have the power to give special emphasis and some direction to selected aspects of education.[20]

The reasoned argument of Principal Corry for direct Federal support is forceful and persuasive.

> It would be incongruous to be asserting federal authority over training for run-of-the-mill jobs in the labour force and abandoning it totally for all professional, scientific and technical personnel educated by the universities. It is the latter who will be critical for national objectives in the future.[21]

If Canada is to survive as a federal state its universities must also survive and the arguments of men like Corry must be acted upon.

There are many works to which reference cannot be made in a broad overview of historical writings on Canadian higher education. One volume which should not be neglected is that by Leopold Infeld, Why I Left Canada.[24] A number of leading scientists and scholars—Rutherford, MacIver, Soddy—to name just three, came to Canada, made their contributions, some in rather short periods of time, and then left for academic posts elsewhere. Infeld was a

member of the mathematics faculty at the University of Toronto from 1938 to 1950. Caught in difficulties flowing from the "Cold War" Infeld returned to Poland. Twenty-eight years later his reflections on science and politics were published by McGill-Queen's University Press. His volume published in Canada in 1978 deals sensitively with a variety of difficult items. Years after he had left Canada he continued to interest himself in the efforts of Canadians to advance the cause of peace among the nations of the world.

Institutional Histories

A considerable number of historical accounts of Canadian universities in both article and monograph form have appeared in the last decade. Since many of the major works have been reviewed in various issues of the Canadian Journal of Higher Education it would be unduly repetitious if I were to repeat here what is set out there. This is also true given the general article by Professor Robin Harris entitled "The Universities of Canada" which appeared initially in the Commonwealth Universities Yearbook, 1974 and in revised form in subsequent Yearbooks to 1980. The availability of Mario Creet's article "H. M. Tory and the Secular University"[23] and the background information it provides in its appendix and statistical tables, diminishes the need for a detailed report on the institutional histories that have appeared in the last ten years.

One noticeable aspect of recent scholarly writing on Canadian higher education is the apparent lack of in-depth analytical reports on the early phases in the development of new universities in Canada. No doubt many internal documents exist in individual institutions and a considerable number of articles on particular developments have appeared in various publications. But more comprehensive assessments are needed on the strengths and weaknesses of the younger members of the Canadian family of universities. Some of these new foundations are now approaching twenty years of age. Others have already passed that mark. We need to know how they are functioning in overall terms.

While critical scholarly writing on the overall functioning and the level of excellence of Canada's new English language universities has not yet reached the desirable level, historians of older Canadian universities are producing outstanding works. In recent years a number of volumes have been published which are of such distinction that special reference must be made to them. Most notable, in my view, are the histories of McMaster by Charles Johnston, of Queen's, by Hilda Neatby, of Western by John Gwynne-Timothy and of McGill by Stanley Frost.

McMaster and the Homogenizing Process in Canadian Higher Education

Charles Johnston has done Canadian higher education a major service through his two-volume history of McMaster.[24] In these two volumes Johnston traces the first seventy years in the life of the university which Senator William McMaster envisaged as being devoted to the offering of a "thoroughly practical Christian course of education."[25] In volume one the history of McMaster University from its birth in 1887 to its move from Toronto to Hamilton in 1930, is set out. The second volume covers the period from 1930 until 1957.

Like many other Canadian universities McMaster was brought into being by a religious denomination and later was secularized. Thus Johnston's history serves not only as a most valuable scholarly account of what happened from the time of McMaster's conception until its separation from its founding Christian community. Johnston's work throws light on the homogenizing process at work in Canadian university life. In a paper presented in 1956, Sidney Smith, then president of the University of Toronto, referred to the "notable similarity"[26] of Canadian English-language universities. Later, in his personal account of life at the University of Toronto, Claude Bissell provided a glimpse into a key element in the homogenizing process. He writes of Professor A.S.P. Woodhouse, who became Chairman of the Department of English, University College, University of Toronto in 1945, as 'despatching' his graduate students to serve in Canada's outlying provinces. One of these:

> Henry Kreisel, who became vice-president of the University of Alberta, recalls how as a young graduate student anxious to get a secure job, he appealed to Woodhouse for help. There was a pause, then the great man said, 'Very well, Kreisel, I will send you to Alberta.'[27]

Bissell went on to note that after he, Bissell, completed his doctorate at Cornell in 1940 he was offered a junior post at the University of Saskatchewan which Woodhouse advised him to accept. "One would not wish to spend his life in the West" wrote Woodhouse. He continued "A good man isn't likely to be trapped, especially if he publishes and has influential friends in the East."[28]

Nineteen years before the first legislature of Alberta created its provincial university, in 1906, McMaster University had come into being through the religious conviction and financial generosity of Senator McMaster. The funds for McMaster, which was granted a provincial charter by the Ontario Legislature in 1887, were entrusted to the Baptist Churches in Ontario and

Quebec. These churches, collectively through an association they formed called the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, accepted full responsibility for their new university. Seventy years later, in 1957, the Baptist Convention was separated from the university which it had accepted originally as a sacred trust. The spiritual responsibility of 1887 appears to have become, in the minds of some Baptists, a financial burden they could no longer bear.

The method chosen for the secularization and subsequent development of McMaster University is informative concerning the process whereby Canadian higher education has been homogenized. Just as the 'despatching' by Professor Woodhouse and other university departmental chairmen in Central Canada of graduates to junior academic posts in distant provinces facilitated that process, so did the separation of the Baptists and other Christian groups from the universities they founded. In McMaster's case the relinquishing of control by religious authorities was not achieved without serious misgivings by many thoughtful Baptists. One of these, V. Evan Gray, a Toronto barrister, set out his ideas in a letter to Chancellor Gilmour in the late Fall of 1944. Gray wrote:

> McMaster University stands as the concrete embodiment of an idea and an ideal of university education under religious auspices, ownership and control, which is as sound today as it ever was. I think McMaster's unique position and character and its direct association with the Baptist democracy represented by its Convention should be maintained both for the sake of the denomination and for the sake of our Canadian educational ideal.[29]

Gray argued that steps should be taken to develop McMaster along the lines of Swarthmore College in the United States. Unless something of this order were done, Gray reasoned:

> The 'New McMaster' would be just another of the chain of 'across-Canada Universities,' all accommodated to a single pattern, which we already see taking form. It is the chain-store principle in national education at the university level, without the uniformity of quality which chain-stores provide. The individuality of McMaster derived from its denominational affiliations and its liberal curriculum will vanish.[30]

The model Gray had in mind did not coincide with the plans of Chancellor Gilmour and Carey Fox, a highly influential member of the McMaster Board for many years. Gilmour was convinced that McMaster could not develop like Swarthmore which, unlike McMaster, had a substantial endowment and

"a constituency of considerable wealth."[31] Carey Fox, who found himself on the outside after his grandfather's meat-packing business had been absorbed into Canada Packers, was not prepared to opt for a United States model for McMaster when the Canadian homogenized variety was working well for Sherwood Fox, the President of the University of Western Ontario in London. Thus McMaster was secularized and homogenized. In his history of McMaster, Johnston tells how this happened and to a considerable extent why it happened.

Queen's University and Its Maintenance of Uniqueness

The history of Queen's University during the period 1841-1917[32] is the first of two volumes which will bring the record of Queen's to 1967 and perhaps beyond. The first volume which the late Professor Neatby prepared is of the same high quality as an institutional history as that by Johnston concerning McMaster. But Professor Neatby's work goes far beyond that of a mere historical account. It is a skilful blending of the history and philosophy of Queen's during its first three-quarters of a century.

Queen's, which came into being over 40 years before McMaster, encountered many of the same type of problems McMaster was to confront later. Divisions within the Presbyterians, although not as explosive, perhaps, as those among the Baptists, troubled the life of Queen's. Forty years before the Baptists lost their central role in McMaster, Presbyterians relinquished control of Queen's. The record of these events in the life of Queen's University is treated in a careful analytical way in Professor Neatby's volume.

Queen's University appears to have escaped the homogenizing tendencies in Canadian higher education to a greater extent than McMaster. Part of the reason for this, of course, is that the constituency which founded Queen's did not tend toward such orally violent divisiveness as McMaster's. Then too, Queen's is situated in a smaller and less industrialized part of Canada than is McMaster. Such reasons however are not sufficient to explain the continuing uniqueness of Queen's.

Through the balanced attention devoted in Professor Neatby's volume, to the life, work and attitudes of the men who guided the fortunes of Queen's in some of its most critical years, we gain insights into the enduring strength and spiritual commitment of Queen's. In particular Professor Neatby provided an admirable account of the work of William Snodgrass, George Monro Grant and Daniel Miner Gordon who together discharged the

responsibilities of the office of Principal, one after the other, from 1864 until 1916. Professor Neatby's work comes to an end in 1917 when Robert Bruce Taylor succeeded Gordon as Principal.

A particularly valuable feature of Neatby's volume is her careful explanation of the political, economic and social context of both Ontario and Canada, which exerted important influences on Queen's as it evolved. Professor Neatby recognized that no institution is an island, entire of itself. Each university has deep roots in the cultural and social continuum of the communities from which it is sprung. In her analysis of the development of Queen's University until 1917 Professor Neatby has helped us to understand the relations between the private internal life of Queen's in the context of the wider public life of the community.

The University of Western Ontario and the Emergence of Canadian Multiversities

In his thoughtful description of the first century in the development of the University of Western Ontario, Professor Gwynne-Timothy has sought to provide a detailed report on the development of an institution of higher learning in terms of its provincial, national and international context.[33] In his volume Professor Gwynne-Timothy undertakes the herculean task of describing that entire portion of the history of higher education in Canada which the University of Western Ontario represents. Writing a thoughtful history of a Canadian college or university as it developed in the nineteenth century and the first half of the twentiety century, has never been easy. But it is not nearly as complex an undertaking as the provision of a thorough account of the vast university Western had become by the end of the third-quarter in the twentieth century when it enrolled over 15,000 full-time students in 15 faculties and schools.

In one aspect of his effort to provide a comprehensive history not only of the University of Western Ontario, but of the cultural, intellectual, professional and social milieu in which it developed, Professor Gwynne-Timothy directs particular attention to a number of highly influential reports. One of these is that on medical education prepared by Abraham Flexner and published in 1910 in the United States. That report "produced a veritable revolution in medical education."[34] Although the Flexner report was on medical education in the United States it became highly influential in Canada as well. Thus Professor Gwynne-Timothy wisely directed attention to it. Similarly he included in his history a thoughtful review of the

Duff Berdahl report, which appeared in 1966, and dealt with university government in Canada. That report had been commissioned by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada.[35] In his account, Professor Gwynne-Timothy also provides detailed information on the homogenizing process in Canadian higher education as it occurred at Western. Whereas both Queen's and McMaster had denominational relationships for seventy years, Western, which was incorporated initially in 1878 as "Western University of London," an Anglican foundation, maintained its denominational connection for less than half that time, becoming a non-denominational institution in 1908. The early secularization of Western, its gradual emergence as a multiversity, and the advice some of its leaders provided to McMaster in the 1930's and 1940's may give us another glimpse into the processes whereby Canadian higher education has been homogenized.

McGill and Perplexing Problems in Canadian Higher Education

The first volume on the history of McGill University written by Professor Stanley B. Frost[36] like that of Hilda Neatby, is a most scholarly and informative volume. With Neatby, Frost seeks to confront both historical and philosophical issues in their cultural, intellectual, political and social context. Thorough analysis of Frost's account of McGill, which takes the record to the end of the Principalship of William Dawson in 1895, improves understanding of the cultural, financial and political problems which McGill encountered. Frost provides valuable information on the divisions in political and religious life in Canada which have had such profound implications. Through a study of various sections of Frost's history one is enabled to understand more fully some of the key factors which played key roles in the formation not only of educational policy but of political policies both in Lower Canada and later in Canada as a whole.

An especially delightful feature of Stanley Frost's work is his description of the character and interests of those who contributed to the development of McGill University in the nineteenth century. His report of Principal William Dawson's desire to ensure that young women would not suffer through the "coarseness of male society" helps us to understand why McGill did not move as quickly to provide women with full opportunities for higher education as did other institutions of higher learning in Canada. For instance McGill did not admit women as students in the faculty of medicine until World War I was ended.

One of the particularly interesting features in this first volume of the new history of McGill is its treatment of financial matters. In the popular mind it has been assumed by many in Canada that the close relationship between McGill and the English 'establishment' in Montreal was a conscious effort to maintain power which should have been shared more widely throughout the province. Frost's volume clearly established that the relationship was not one of contrived convenience but rather one of absolute necessity. During the colonial period the government did not provide the funds required for McGill to develop as a centre for higher learning. Those determined to develop McGill found it essential to turn to well-to-do-members of the English community in Quebec. The report in this volume concerning the financial difficulties of McGill in the nineteenth century, and its need to seek its own independent sources of funding and how that funding was secured, may be increasingly valuable in the last quarter of the twentieth century as universities throughout Canada are confronted by increasingly difficult financial problems.

One particular aspect of Frost's history of McGill should be noted. He provides detailed information concerning the life and work of Principal William Dawson, one of Canada's most effective and thoughtful university presidents. Like many of his contemporaries Dawson had major reservations on widening acceptance of mechanistic interpretations. Like Penfield, many years later, Dawson was anxious to ensure that the scientific frame of reference as it evolved would in no way impede the free flow of mental currents. Throughout his life he had sought to understand phenomena in their totality and was not afraid to expose himself to new experiences which could not be explained in the strict and limited terms of science. Frost makes it clear that Dawson recognized the need to foster McGill's growth as a centre for the development of the creative minds of youth. And he was anxious to ensure that the growth of such minds would not be impeded by the unduly rigid frame of reference which other scientists, with more limited vision, were seeking to put in place.

Canadians need to know more of the intellectual life of men like William Dawson. Through his history of McGill, and the illumination it provides us on the inner life of individuals such as William Dawson, the author of the first volume in the new history of McGill is helping to meet that need.

The Goals of Canadian Universities

Through the writing of Johnston, Neatby, Gwynne-Timothy and Frost, and many others interested in Canadian academic life, the precise nature of the goals of Canadian universities, and how and why they have or have not, been achieved, are being clarified. The scholarly contributions of such individuals, coupled with earlier and contemporary presentations of the "idea" of the university, have provided Canadians with a wealth of material on the "idea" and ideals of the university in both theory and practice. Those wishing to foster the revitalization of the Canadian university need to draw systematically and thoughtfully on such material and to apply the lessons learned judiciously in their respective colleges and universities.

Duncan Campbell, in his illuminating report on the goals of the President of the University of Alberta in the 1960's has observed correctly that:

> One is more likely to get a clearer view of what the outcome of the university as an institution ought to be if one can first get clear what its goals are and have been.[37]

The actual task of clarifying what the goals are and have been, however, is much more difficult in practice than it is in theory.

The Confused Canons of the Canadian Academy

Every organization necessarily requires its own canons, its own established aims and rules for achieving them. This is particularly true in academic life. The bases on which individuals should relate to one another and work together need to be clear. One major source of the contemporary predicament of Canadian universities is lack of understanding concerning the rules that have been established and which should be followed. Since general agreement concerning the goals of the university and how they should be achieved are often lacking, "Whirl is King" as Dr. William Sibley suggested nearly a decade ago.

> Reason, order, authority—is displaced by Whirl, by vortices of frenetic activity in which we are caught but of which we have small comprehension and even less control ....
>
> Like other institutions the university is caught in a vortex of social, political, economic and technological forces .... Our predicament is that ... traditional, central values are threatened by the inability of the system as a whole to escape the vortex and to move with resolution on a course of its own.[38]

Historically, the university, as a unique cultural institution, has been committed to reason, excellence, objectivity, intellectual independence and scholarly community. Other institutions and organizations in our society are concerned with one or more of these values. No other institution however, has been committed to all of these values simultaneously, to the same extent as the university has been over many decades.

In earlier times of adversity the university endured because a body of its members were committed to these basic academic values. That it did endure should not be attributed merely to the desire of human beings to know and the need of society for professionally trained specialists. The university endured because groups of scholars down through the centuries dedicated themselves to institutions of higher learning in which reason, excellence, objectivity, intellectual independence and scholarly community were central. As life became increasingly mechanized, however, in the nineteenth century sensitive individuals such as John Henry Newman and many others were deeply concerned regarding the future of higher learning. Newman was aware that countless human beings, through the work of the university, had developed those habits of mind and activity which liberated them from the limited lives they might have lived otherwise. The disciplines of mind and body, which serious university study still requires, enabled such individuals to gain the attributes of internal freedom, calmness, equitableness, fairness, moderation and wisdom which are of such value in human life.

Newman was deeply troubled by the current of contemporary events when he gave the nine lectures which became the central core of his celebrated volume The Idea of a University, first published in 1853.[39] Newman foresaw a day in which:

> The springs of man's spirit would go dry, so that the soil which nurtured him would produce, as it were, no fruit or flower but only weird, often exhilerating chemical concentrates of literature and art.[40]

Similarly the Russian writer, Dostoevski, became convinced that "man's adoration of himself, taking the place of his worship of God, would spawn a race of demons whose pride would fully reveal the potential cruelty of the intelligence."[41] Dostoevski's fellow Russian, Leo Tolstoi, was profoundly frightened by the vision of engineers becoming the new barbarians.

Newman's fellow countryman, Matthew Arnold, shared Newman's foreboding over the tendencies in the higher learning of his time. In one of his best-remembered poems Arnold wrote:

> And we are here as on a darkling plain
> Swept with confused alarms of struggle and flight,
> Where ignorant armies clash by night.[42]

Newman saw the clear possibility that the inner life of intelligent people would be truncated and that through their disuse of "the nobler muscles of the mind" ordinary citizens would lack examples of something better than "the holyday of resourceless ignorance."

Changes in the values of individual members of Canadian universities occurred gradually during the century following the first publicaiton of Newman's The Idea of a University. Beneath the surface intellectual and spiritual life was being altered as cultural life was being cut off from its roots. The new conditions produced what has been described by Erich Heller as The Disinherited Mind[43] of which Hitler and Stalin are prominent examples. In 1958 Otto Butz, a graduate of the University of Toronto, and subsequently of Princeton, edited a volume of essays by eleven American college senior students.[44] The information contained in that volume provided only one small indication, soon to be supported by an increasing torrent of evidence that universities had begun to slip from their traditional "moorings and to move ... at first gently but then with increasing velocity into a quite different period."[45]

Competing Conceptions of the University

In the late 1960's and early 1970's a host of opposing opinions concerning the university were championed. Some bore no relation whatever to the classic version of the university. Others were based on self-help or mutual aid theories. Many reflected the profound alienation of the time. We heard of the need for "free" universities. Central emphasis was placed on the role of the university in human adjustment. In this context it was not surprising to find the university being described as "a 'therapeutic community,' functioning as a sort of 'psychiatric day hospital.'"[46]

The end result was that the university was in danger of losing its own essential qualities, of being transformed into a new type of agency focusing on immediate personal and group interests. In some measure those who put forward these far-out suggestions knew that something had broken loose in social life and was knocking at the heart of mankind. The question was, "How should the university respond?" Utopian ideas reflected attempts to respond to human need. The new models stemmed in part from

the deepening sense of anger and frustration on the part of both some faculty members and students. As universities had expanded and became more bureaucratic, many faculty members and students began to feel they were being treated as standardized, interchangeable parts in an increasingly heartless information utility in which individual needs and interests were all too often neglected. Thus students and faculty members began to organize to change the university in ways which they thought were essential.

The Changing Ideas of the Canadian Association of University Teachers

In 1960 a Committee, appointed by the Canadian Association of University Teachers "recommended that university government be wholly entrusted to university scholars and that all administrative officers in the university from the president downward should be made elective for stated terms."[47] Later the Canadian Association of University Teachers joined with the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada to establish a commission on university government to which reference was made previously. In their 1966 report the commissioners on university government recommended that faculty associations in Canadian universities should remain outside rather than be brought into the formal constitutional structure of individual universities.[48]

The commissioners made this recommendation despite the concern expressed by various faculty leaders that if academic senates rather than faculty associations were to be used as "the main vehicle for the expression of staff opinion on educational policy, the Association might be reduced to a sterile salary pressure group."[49]

Several years after the Report on University Government in Canada appeared, Professor W. B. Cunningham of Mount Allison University observed that:

> to leave the faculty association outside the formal structure is to say that the association is of marginal importance and significance to the university, a body that can be consulted if convenient and otherwise largely neglected except to the extent that it can exert pressures that would be politically inexpedient for the official bodies to ignore.[50]

In retrospect the leaving of the faculty associations in individual Canadian universities outside the formal constitutional structure resulted in a profound change in the attitude of faculty members some of whom

argued cogently that academics should not be regarded as employees. Professor W. L. Morton had argued, for instance, that it would be manifestly dangerous for those responsible for Canadian universities to assume that faculty members "should be held to be engaged in a master-servant relationship, or should be treated in terms of labour-management relationship." This would involve the importation, wrote Professor Morton, "into the necessarily free society of scholarship and science, the authoritarian and arbitrary temper and the irrelevant assumptions of an alien community, that of business and industry."[51] That is precisely what happened!

In explanation of why faculty associations across Canada turned to unionization, the Chairman of the Ontario Confederation of University Faculty Associations outlined some of the reasons why large numbers of Canadian academics ceased to stress their professional status and sought recognition as employees. University budgets were being squeezed ever tighter and faculty members had been witnessing the worsening conditions in libraries and laboratories coupled with the deterioration of their income in constant dollars and the mounting threats of dismissals for reason of financial exigency. The atmosphere of budgetary stringency was tending to break down faculty "collegiality." In some universities faculty members resented what they regarded as autocratic attitudes on the part of senior administrators. In others "there were misgivings about the competence of the people in charge."[52] Professor Horn noted that, while few academics had even considered unionization before the early 1970's, the move toward unionization had been undertaken to protect collegiality and to provide an improved basis for faculty strength against the centralizing efforts of university administrators. Those faculty associations which had sought registration under Labour Relations legislation had done so because in Professor Horn's view such recognition could serve "as an effective means to defend academic freedom and secure other ends."[53] In conclusion he wrote:

> Threats to the high quality of Ontario university education do indeed exist. The damage done by the current provincial budgetary squeeze and the federal government's reduction in support for scientific and scholarly research is no longer a matter for conjecture.[54]

The move toward unionization is understandable given the worsening economic situation and the need for faculty members, like everyone else, to gain the best possible security in respect of employment. The

introduction of the trade union model, however, brought new values into the formal life of the university. The possibility that this would occur had led Professor Cunningham to suggest that members of faculty associations "should refrain from stating that the principal purpose of the faculty association is to promote the well-being of the university community. A subsidiary purpose is to protect the welfare of its members."[55] The secondary purpose of faculty associations began to take precedence over the primary purpose. While understandable, this contributed to a basic confusion as to the primary objectives of faculty members.

Historically academics had claimed that universities were committed to reason, excellence, objectivity, intellectual independence and scholarly community. With the move to unionization, other values were regarded as equally significant and emphasis was placed on remuneration as well as reason; on employment as well as on excellence; on subjectivity as well as objectivity; on collective security as well as on intellectual independence, and on adversarialism as well as on scholarly community.

Given that the economic situation of universities may become even more difficult, one hesitates to reflect on what may ultimately happen to the traditional values of the university. In this context, however, the possibility of the demise of the university as an institution dedicated primarily to intellectual virtues becomes frighteningly real. While institutions bearing the designation 'university' will no doubt continue, it is altogether likely, given the deepening economic difficulties, that these institutions will be primarily public information utilities in which individuals will receive advanced training in a wide variety of academic and professional technologies. Unless positive steps are taken to remove the confusion of values in the contemporary university, the higher learning traditionally assumed to be available in universities, in all likelihood will be provided in only a very limited number of institutions.

Reasons for the Earlier Survival of Universities

Universities have survived, over the centuries, because a sufficient body of senior members have been dedicated primarily to causes above and beyond their own immediate personal interests. Universities maintained support because they provided not merely professional training to prepare people for employment, but because they provided higher learning as well. Historically, the university has recognized that professional training,

to the extent that it should be provided within universities, should be based in considerable measure on programs of studies designed to improve the higher faculties of individuals. For this reason the university has been committed to the goal and values which are commonly associated with such terms as reason, excellence, objectivity, intellectual independence and scholarly community. These have been the goals, the means and the central value of the university over the centuries.

To attain these goals senior members of the universities have each committed themselves to a cause beyond themselves. They have sought to be dedicated to such life-enhancing activity. By virtue of the privileged position senior members have enjoyed they are assumed to have gained the capacity to help contribute directly to the advancement of human life, to contribute to our individual and collective life.

If the commitment of the members of the university, to its historic values, comes to an end then the university will die as an intellectual and scholarly institution. And something of great value will have gone out of human life.

The University and the Struggle Between the Cooperative Conception of Human Life and the Authoritarian Conception

Whether or not the university, as a scholarly centre for higher learning, survives, will be determined by the result of the broader struggle underway in the world between two competing conceptions of human life. The struggle between these two conceptions is fundamentally a struggle between those who believe that human beings have the capacity to work together cooperatively for the advancement of human life and those who believe that such advancement may only be achieved through the essential conflict of opposing interests seeking to enforce their own authority.

In the cooperative view of human nature, politics is regarded as the art of reaching non-coercive adjustments between antagonistic interests. To achieve such adjustments it is assumed that democratic procedures and rational discussion have key roles to play. In opposition to this cooperative view, represented in the classic ideas of the university, is the authoritarian view which assumes that there are fundamental, irreconcilable differences between classes and groups in society and that if advancement is to be made the authority of the superior way must be enforced.

In essence this struggle between the cooperative view of human life, politics and social institutions, which is opposed by the authoritarian view, may be interpreted as the encounter between those individuals and groups committed to gradual evolutionary change based on rational discussion, as opposed to those who believe that revolution is required along with the authority that a revolution brings whereby the necessary reforms may be achieved.

It must be stressed here that this struggle is not that of liberal versus conservative, union versus management or capitalist versus communist. It is a struggle between open inquiring minds and closed dictatorial minds. This struggle transcends all institutional, political and national boundaries.

Thus the struggle, over the bases on which the affairs of the university are to be conducted, involves far more than appears on the surface in the present debate concerning methods for resolving disagreements in the university. What happens in the university, however, is of crucial significance. It is in the universities that the ideas which determine the course of human civilization are often formed and begin to become influential. The most dramatic example, of course, are the ideas developed in the university by celebrated scientists such as Einstein, Fermi and others, which led to the creation of the atomic bomb. These ideas themselves were the result of the application of the scientific method in which university men like Galileo pioneered.

In the development of new ideas, liberal intellectuals have played strategic roles. During the 1960's and early 1970's, however, liberal intellectuals found themselves in extremely difficult circumstances. They are still in difficulty.

The Place of Liberal Intellectuals in the Contemporary Crisis of the University

In his volume, The Campus War[56] John Searle wrote of the mature, humane, liberal intellectuals. His analysis of their role in the difficulties of the university in the late 1960's and early 70's brought him to the conclusion that the influence of liberal intellectuals was "nothing short of disaster." In explanation he argued that such individuals:

> are too high-principled to engage in any long-term calculation or consideration on the consequences of their actions. They avoid 'Machiavellianism' and attempt to do the right thing here and now. Convinced that the administration is filled

> with crass bureaucrats they attempted to rescue the university in its all too frequent times of need. But the net effect of their effort is usually such that the whole place would have been better off if they had stuck to their books and left governance to the crass bureaucrats. The most important reason for this is that they are incapable of calculating long-term political consequences and so with the best of intentions they undertake actions that undermine the system of authority within the university and invite reprisal from without.[57]

In part the profound difficulty in which universities in the Western world now find themselves may be traced to the attitudes of well-intentioned liberal academics in the late 1960's and early 1970's. In many cases they were deeply troubled by what they saw happening in the universities. But they did not want to interfere with what was going on in the event that their actions might be misunderstood by their faculty colleagues or by their students. Thus they did not take the stand required on crucial issues and the university suffered severely.

If the death of the university is to be avoided then liberal intellectuals within the university must develop much more clearly than they have in the past, their views on key issues in the university and they must act to ensure that the intellectual values of the university are preserved. One of the areas in which liberal intellectuals can help the university renew itself is in the area of the attitudes of the university to money.

The University and Money

In the modern university it is often jestingly suggested that in academic life there are "no problems which another million dollars wouldn't cure."[58] It is clear, however, that while money is obviously necessary for the operation of universities the sources of money, the bases on which funds are granted and the amounts provided, all exert major influences. Money may solve problems. It may also accentuate them.

Money is a source of power, but it also is a primary source of disaster. H. G. Wells once observed that "money floated the Romans off the firm ground."[59] The money made available in such large amounts to universities across Canada during the years 1960-1975 may have floated Canada's institutions of higher learning off firm intellectual ground. The allocation of large sums of money to academic affairs clearly contributed to the bureaucratization of university life as the number of administrators in colleges and universities increased and the number of civil servants, responsible for the oversight of grants and regulations relating to them, multiplied.

It may seem ridiculous, on the surface, to argue that too much money is a major source of difficulties for the university. However, a good case can be made in defense of this view. In her presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada in 1972 the late Professor Hilda Neatby maintained that the large sums of money granted Canadian universities by public authorities were accentuating their problems. She argued that the large sums of money granted to the universities by democratic governments, which tend to think of democracy in merely egalitarian terms, had been obscuring and smothering the essential principles of the university to the point that universities are "in grave danger of disintegrating and of disappearing."[60]

During the 19th and early 20th centuries universities had received, in many cases, substantial funds from particular individuals. This almost invariably gave rise to anxious concern on the part of academics as to what the benefactors really wished to have done with their money and what 'deals' administrators had made. Academics were troubled by the influence that large amounts of money would have on the policies of the university, particularly in those areas in which the independence of the university might be undermined. There were specific concerns regarding the effects of the acceptance of large amounts of money on academic freedom. In Canada a precise definition was given to academic freedom by the Canadian Association of University Teachers. It reads as follows:

> Academic freedom includes the right within the university to decide who shall teach, who shall be taught, and what shall be studied, taught or published. Because a university's essential concerns are intellectual, academic freedom involves the right of appointment of staff or admission of student regardless of race, sex, religion or politics. It involves the right to teach, investigate and speculate without deference to prescribed doctrine. It involves the right to criticize the university.[61]

It will be noted that special reference was made in that statement concerning "the right within the university to decide who shall teach, who shall be taught ...." The issue of "who shall be taught" has raised a variety of difficult problems the resolution of which influenced the amount of funds provided to universities. Intervention by state authorities in academic affairs has usually occurred when governments answerable to an egalitarian electorate are anxious to prevent what they regard as undue restriction of entry.[62] In Ontario we have had interesting examples of the state's enunciation of its views on admission standards in provincially financed universities. In a statement on 21 March 1963, to the Ontario

Legislature, Premier John Robarts said:

> The Government does not look with approval on any university requiring unreasonably high standards of admission. It is our viewpoint that the admission standards should be moderate and reasonable and such as to enable the average student to proceed to a degree. I feel that a flexible standard between 55 and 60 per cent, depending on the type of course, could define what I mean by 'the average student.'[63]

Ontario universities, particularly the new universities which had little if any endowment funds and were dependent almost entirely on public support, naturally endeavoured to respond thoughtfully and sympathetically to the statement made by the Premier of Ontario in its Legislature. The extent to which individual universities reduced their admission standards is not clear. What is clear, is that a large number of students entered the universities of Ontario in the 1960's and during the early 1970's. Gradually, however, enrolment began to level off and in some cases declined. This gave rise to anxiety in university circles since individual universities had appointed substantial numbers of full-time faculty members and had continuing financial obligations. If the number of students were to decline seriously major problems would arise. It was in this context that on Friday 11 April 1975 a front-page story in The Globe and Mail contained a report of some of the views of the Ontario Minister of Colleges and Universities on university entrance standards. The Minister, Mr. James Auld, was quoted as saying:

> Academic requirements for admission to Ontario universities have fallen in the past two decades to a point where administrators now should ask themselves if all their new students should be in post-secondary institutions.[64]

The Minister, Mr. Auld, was also quoted saying that when the student assistance program is included, the taxpayers of Ontario were paying nearly 90% of the cost of post-secondary education. It is interesting to note that in his comments concerning university entrance requirements Mr. Auld gave no indication of the role the Government of Canada was playing in funding universities. Nor did Mr. Auld refer to the statement made twelve years earlier by Premier Robarts. It was clear, however, that the Government of Ontario which turned on the tap to allow public funds to flow to Ontario universities could also tighten the tap and restrict the flow.

Dominant Features and Some Shortcomings of Recent Writing on Higher Education in Canada

Throughout this paper I have noted the high quality of thought which many Canadians are devoting to contemporary problems in higher education. Even a cursory scanning of the articles which have appeared in The Canadian Journal of Higher Education over the last decade gives one a glimpse of the depth of recent thought which has been and is being devoted to university affairs in Canada. One must hope, however, that the new means of information processing will soon be employed to integrate the available material and to present it in coordinated form on the wide variety of topics which require attention in the revitalization of our universities. If this is done, those who are well situated to contribute to the renewal of Canadian academic institutions would have immediately at hand, specific information based on in-depth study which would aid them in their work.

There is one particular shortcoming in recent literature on Canadian universities to which I would like to draw attention. It relates to the uniqueness of Canadian universities.

Clarifying the Nature of What Canadian Universities Are and What They Could Become

In a seminal article which appeared in 1977, Claude Bissell asked the question: "To what extent have our universities developed distinctive Canadian characteristics, and what role can they play in clarifying what we have been and what we might become."[65] In his answer to that question Dr. Bissell made a variety of suggestions which in my judgment merit action. I urge all who are concerned regarding the future of Canadian universities to read that article and take steps to ensure that as far as possible the suggestions it contains are implemented in their respective universities.

In addition to the points raised in Dr. Bissell's article there is a particular point to which I would like to draw attention. This involves the constitutional differences between Canadian and United States universities. In my judgment Canadians have not examined carefully enough the unique constitutional nature of their universities and the opportunities to which their constitutions give rise.

The move toward faculty unionization in the United States occurred for a number of reasons. One was the corporate form of universities in the United States. In the vast majority of cases faculty members in the

United States are subject, in legal terms, to the undivided control of non-academic boards of trustees which enjoy the corporate powers of their respective universities. In most Canadian universities, although not in all, the corporate powers are shared. Faculty members in many Canadian universities, through their academic senate to which exclusive authority is granted by their charters for the making of all academic policies, participate directly both by law and custom in the management of their universities. Decisions faculty members take in Canadian universities, by virtue of the statutory powers granted to senates and faculty councils, predetermine in substantial measure the entire budgets of Canadian universities. Faculty members in the United States also make academic decisions in their institutions. But the overwhelming majority of American professors do so not by virtue of statutory powers granted to academic senates, as do Canadian professors, but rather through the exercise of authority delegated to academics by boards of trustees.

The acts governing Canadian universities often indicate that the power of the boards of governors or trustees are specifically limited. In many cases the powers of such boards begin with a specific limitation. It usually takes the following form:

> Except as to such matters by this Act specifically assigned to the Senate, the government, conduct, management and control of the University and of its property, revenues, expenditures, business and affairs, are vested in the Board.

Often in the margin of the acts governing Canadian universities there appears beside that expressed limitation, the notation "Management of universities vested in Board." Such notations, which have no legal status, are misleading in many cases. To the extent that a Canadian university is a university it is managed by the faculty. In Canada faculty members manage those functions of their universities which make it a university by virtue of legal powers granted to academic bodies. In some cases these powers are subject to certain limitations in respect of the expenditure of money. In others they are not limited. Nonetheless, Canadian faculty members decide such questions as: "Who shall teach? Who shall study? What shall be taught? How shall it be taught?" All of these decisions are made by faculty members in Canada on the basis of statutory powers granted to them. Their academic colleagues in the United States rarely enjoy this statutory power.

The key point I wish to make is that the constitutional nature of

Canadian universities makes possible the development of a cooperative model, based on law, for the management of the affairs of universities. It was and is not necessary, in my judgment, for Canadian academics to opt for the labour-management model to attain all their objectives.

I hope that, as Canadian academics become better acquainted with the precise constitutional nature of their universities, they will seek to develop cooperative models for the conduct, management and control of the affairs of their universities. Unfortunately thus far, sufficient attention has not been directed in scholarly writings on the constitution of Canadian universities to their uniqueness in respect of the formal statutory authority granted to Canadian academics through their senates and faculty councils as compared with the lack of such statutory authority for academics in American universities.[66]

If action is taken to help Canadian academics realize, and to act on, the potential inherent in the charters creating their universities for the development of a cooperative system for the management and control of Canadian universities, then we should be better equipped to deal with some of the underlying sources of the difficulties which are confronting universities.

Sources of the Shortcomings of Contemporary Universities

Throughout the centuries universities have functioned as primary intellectual and social institutions when three conditions have prevailed.

(1) The internal life of the university must be characterized by widespread agreement concerning the primary purposes of the university, a high degree of mutual confidence and trust must prevail and harmonious means must be operative for resolving internal disagreements.
(2) The university must enjoy the continuing confidence and support of primary authorities in the community.
(3) The university must be perceived to be a primary intellectual centre for the preservation and advancement of knowledge and the preparation of individuals required to meet mankind's emerging needs.

From the mid 1960's onwards the university has appeared, to many thoughtful individuals, to be increasingly weak in all three of these areas in which it must be strong. A number of reasons for the declining strength

of the university in these three particular areas may be identified.

The university, like all other institutions in the modern world, has been profoundly influenced by two developments which have gradually gained momentum over the last four-hundred years. These developments may be described as the transformation of the ideas of philosophers into dynamic creeds of liberation and the mechanization of most aspects of human life.

Some of the conflict in ideas and the release of moral passions occasioned through the transformation of ideas of philosophers, into creeds of liberation, has been beneficial. However, there are aspects of this transformation which occasioned havoc in human life. For instance, the strange groups of ideas which were brought together in the doctrines of the Nazi party were regarded by some as a creed of liberation. All of us know the extreme price that was paid before mankind was rid of Nazi power..

Creeds of liberation, based on the ideas of philosophers, have exerted influence on universities. I shall mention only the ideas of Voltaire and Rousseau as examples.

Voltaire concluded that human beings are strange mixtures of goodness and badness and that it isn't always easy to be certain which is which. Thus Voltaire preached tolerance. He regarded the arts and sciences as primary means for the civilizing and refining of human beings.

Rousseau, on the other hand, looked on the arts and sciences as means whereby the gifts of natural man were corrupted. While Rousseau did not approve of violence, nonetheless, his ideas concerning man and nature fostered the view that an effective way to improve society would be to destroy it. Rousseau became highly indignant over the cruelties and evils which he saw visited upon ordinary human beings. He was highly distrustful of the mechanizing tendencies he saw developing.

To the middle of the 1960's most universities proceeded along lines which Voltaire would have found satisfactory. Like Voltaire most universities regarded the arts and sciences as means for civilizing and refining of human beings. Such universities put particular emphasis on tolerance.

Then in the mid 1960's ideas similar to those Rousseau had espoused began to sweep across the campuses in the Western world. Rousseau had argued that human nature was pure and good, that evil and corruption were the work of society and would be banished if individuals were allowed to

develop freely. In the 1960's it was widely suggested that individual students and faculty members were naturally good and that those responsible for the administration of colleges and universities, those who served as trustees, as representatives of organized society, were naturally evil and corrupt. I need not go into detail concerning the conflict which arose. All who are familiar with the history of Canadian universities over the last two decades, know what happened.

Members of universities and colleges across Canada need to be aware of the extent to which the ideas of philosophers, when transformed into creeds of liberation, can result in irrational activities. In large measure such creeds of liberation are based on simplistic, sometimes incoherent and often inadequate interpretations. Thoughtful members of colleges and universities recognize the advantages of simplicity. At the same time they know that complex problems usually do not have easy answers. However, one thing is certain. Members of colleges and universities should be more conscious in the future than they have been in the past concerning the extent to which their lives are being influenced by the transformation of the ideas of philosophers into dynamic creeds of liberation.

I referred earlier to the profound impact which mechanization has had on human life. Leading members of the university throughout many centuries have contributed to the mechanization of human thought and action. Mechanization involves the division of things into components. Galileo engaged in what might be described as an act of mechanization when he decided that he would devote particular attention to the study of mass and motion and set aside, temporarily, matters involving colour, sound and smell. With his problem simplified Galileo devoted himself to the study of mass and motion.

The temporary division which Galileo made, between knowledge having characteristics that could be measured and those which could not be measured, became a permanent separation through the work of Rene Descartes who made a clear distinction between mind and body. One of the most influential conclusions an individual ever reached was that reached by Descartes. He became convinced, as had earlier Greek thinkers that the structure of nature is inherently mathematical. From the time of Descartes onward there has been increasing emphasis on the subdivision of knowledge into fundamental units of information which may be manipulated. Thus John Cockcroft, the British Nobel Laureate, once observed to me that a primary emphasis in

science during the last one-hundred years had been on "taking the world apart." This mechanistic approach is occasionally described as the resolutive-compositive method which has brought so many advances in scientific understanding. All of us are grateful for the amazing advances which have occurred in medical science. On the other hand we are profoundly troubled by the nuclear umbrella which has been spread across the northern hemisphere as a result of the utilization of the resolutive-compositive method. Mechanization has both advantages and disadvantages.

The distinguished English scientist, Isaac Newton, known primarily for his scientific contributions looked on the whole universe and all that is in it as a riddle:

> as a secret which could be read by applying pure thought to a certain evidence ... he ... read the riddle of the heavens. And he believed that by the same powers of his introspective imagination he would read the riddle of the Godhead, the riddle of past and future events.[67]

Newton had a particular interest both in religious and scientific issues. Popular interpretations of his work, however, led to the belief that the world had been created by a master craftsman who had sent the world off into space in the care of human beings who no longer had need of Providence. It was assumed that through the advancement of human knowledge and the use of human rationality, mankind would progress. Thus unintentionally, through his identification of fundamental principles concerning the world of nature as he understood it, Newton came to be regarded as having driven God out of the world. Later through the use of the same methods many assumed that Darwin had driven God out of nature and in due course Freud has been assumed to have driven God out of the human soul.

Many of the problems of the modern university stem from the acceptance of the mechanistic method in the organization and management of contemporary universities. Given the crises in the university, and the awesome nuclear peril under which mankind lives, new wholistic cooperative ways of thinking must be found, taught and acted upon.

Happily there are signs that such new ways are emerging.

Signs of Hope in Contemporary Academic Life in Canada

The critical age in which we live requires new insights for the resolution of its crises. Among those who have contributed liberally in this regard was the late Abraham Maslow. Ideas which he set out in a lecture

at the University of Saskatchewan in October 1962 are indicative of the insights he shared. The paper he published following that lecture is highly stimulating.[68] I shall quote two short passages from that paper.

> The best way to view a present problem is to give it all you've got, to study it and its nature, to perceive within it the intrinsic inter-relationships, to discover (rather than to invent) the answer to the problem within the problem itself. This is also the best way to look at a painting or to listen to a patient in therapy.
> ...
> Often we use the present not for its own sake but in order to prepare for the future. Think how often in a conversation we put on a listening face as the other person talks, secretly however preparing what we are going to say, rehearsing, planning a counter-attack perhaps.[69]

In his paper Maslow opens up new vistas on the desirable form research and human relationships should take in the modern university. His ideas are for me a primary sign of new hope.

The late Charles Snow created a stir in intellectual circles through the Rede Lecture he delivered in the University of Cambridge in 1959. That lecture was entitled The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution.[70] In that lecture Snow placed major emphasis on the need to close the gap between the humanities and the sciences. In particular he argued that those who studied the humanities should become thoroughly familiar with the values of science. That is obviously desirable. But there is a parallel need and that is to ensure that science and the manner in which it is applied should be fully alert to the central needs of humanity. For centuries as science developed in the Western world it was assumed that scientists could not be held responsible for the ways in which their findings were applied. Now, however, in the climate of "anti-science" and deepening commitment to the maintenance of the health of the earth, scientists are recognizing that they cannot detach themselves from such concerns. Indeed, scientists in many countries are playing key roles in seeking to deal with the environmental problems. Many committed scientists are seeking to find the means whereby mankind may abolish war just as slavery was abolished in the 19th century.

Similarly there are new signs of hope in the attitude of scholars concerning what can be known and how it is to be known. Northrop Frye recently made a helpful observation in this connection. He noted:

> At the beginning of this century there was a strong sense that reality was divided into the subjective and objective, and that science was concerned only with the latter. But even in the physical sciences it soon became clear that the observer himself was a part of the scene to be observed, and of course the social sciences are entirely based on this principle.[71]

We find new hope also in the emergence of new attitudes in the social sciences. In this connection I refer you to the fine article by Professor Larry J. Fisk "Contributions to a Regenerated Social Science" which appeared in The Canadian Journal of Higher Education in 1976.[72]

Another sign of hope that Canadian universities may be revitalized is seen in the variety of thoughtful volumes which are appearing concerning university affairs. I have already made reference to a number of these. I wish now to direct special attention to two books and one article.

One of the most thoughtful volumes I have read in the last decade is that by C. S. Belshaw, Towers Besieged: The Dilemma of the Creative University.[73] In that volume Belshaw argues that a university must engender in both student and faculty members the ability to formulate and ask questions related to generalized knowledge; to use evidence, logic, and intuitive judgment to provide answers. Universities have a responsibility to help their members develop their powers of scientific, aesthetic and moral judgment. Belshaw's work merits careful reading.

In his volume On the Idea of a University Professor J. M. Cameron brings us back again to Newman's classic description of the university as a centre of liberal education.[74] In this crisp volume Professor Cameron argues that liberal education must become, once again, the heart of university studies. At the same time he recognizes that a place must be provided in the university also for natural science and for the technologies. Cameron is convinced that these subjects may also be studied liberally and he provides helpful insights in this regard.

In his book Professor Cameron makes the following observation:

> Institutions have in some sense minds and identities that persist through time, though their secure possession needs to be continually asserted, like a public right to gather firewood or graze the goose on common land, if it is to be maintained. And institutions can die.[75]

Another work to which I refer you as a sign of hope in contemporary Canadian academic life is an article by Robert Burch on "Jaspers' Concept of the University."[76] This article is an excellent treatise on the ideas

of the distinguished German philosopher Karl Jaspers on the university. I urge all who are interested in the revitalization of Canadian universities to study Mr. Burch's article with care. All who do so will profit greatly.

Conclusion

There are some clear steps that those dedicated to the renewal of Canadian university life should take. In my view the Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education should establish a permanent ongoing institute for the advancement of the study of higher education and the application of knowledge concerning universities in individual colleges and universities throughout our country. My judgment is that adequate funding for such a permanent institute could be secured from independent non-governmental sources. Such an institute should take the necessary steps to integrate available knowledge concerning higher education in Canada and to help individual institutions to apply such knowledge. However, priority should be given to research in those critical areas of university life in which I have indicated revitalization is utterly essential.

Sometimes it is assumed that the role of historians and philosophers cannot be creative. But philosophers and historians play key roles. They maintain the memory of mankind and are most influential in determining what can and what cannot be believed. Historians and philosophers of Canadian higher education are at the crossroads of the crisis in Canadian academic life. They can help to direct academic life toward a new co-operative and hopeful future. Or they may, through merely focusing on narrow issues, contribute to the deepening crisis in the Canadian academy.

The way is open for the revitalization of academic life in Canada. Our universities need not die as centres of higher learning. The issue before us is whether we can develop within ourselves the will and those qualities of mind and action necessary to effect the essential revitalization.

In one of his poems George Meredith wrote:

> Passions spin the plot:
> We are betrayed by what is false within.[77]

It must also be noted that we may be liberated by what is true within, and when faculty members earnestly seek truth, students are not listless.

4 June 1981

FOOTNOTES

1. George Grant, "The Battle Between Teaching and Research," The Globe and Mail, Toronto. Monday, 28 April 1980, p. 7

2. Ernest Becker, "Crisis of the Modern University," Vernon F. Haubrick, ed., Freedom, Bureaucracy & Schooling, Washington, D.C.: Committee of Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1971 Yearbook, p. 187.

3. Cambridge University Reporter, No. 4365, Friday, 6 October 1961, Vol. XCII, No. 4, p. 257.

4. Abraham H. Maslow, "The Creative Attitude," Eli Bornstein, ed., The Structurist, No. 3, 1963, p. 7.

5. Robin S. Harris and Arthur Tremblay, A Bibliography of Higher Education in Canada - Bibliographie De L'Enseignement Superieur Au Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press and Presses University Laval, 1959 and Supplements 1965 and 1971.

6. Robin S. Harris, A History of Higher Education in Canada 1663-1960, Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press, 1976.

7. L. K. Shook, Catholic Post-Secondary Education in English-Speaking Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

8. T. H. B. Symons, To Know Ourselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies, Vol. I and II, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975.

9. W. G. Fleming, Education: Ontario's Preoccupation, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

10. Murray G. Ross, The University: The Anatomy of Academe, Toronto: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

11. Gwen Pilkington, "A History of the National Conference of Canadian Universities 1911-1961," Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto, 1974.

12. R. M. Gill, "Universities and Development in Quebec," Ph.D. Thesis, Duke University, 1976.

13. Claude Bissell, Halfway up Parnassus: A Personal Account of the University of Toronto 1932-1971, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.

14. Wilder Penfield, Second Thoughts: Science, the Arts and the Spirit, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1970.

15. Ibid., p. 10.

16. Ibid., pp. 21-22.

17. Ibid., pp. 32-39.

18. J. A. Corry, Farewell the Ivory Tower: Universities in Transition, Montreal and London: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1970.

19. Ibid., p. 41.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., p. 42.

22. Leopold Infeld, Why I Left Canada: Reflections on Science and Politics, Lewis Pyenson, ed., Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978, 272 p.

23. Mario Creet, "H. M. Tory and the Secular University," Queen's University, 1 April, 1981.

24. Charles M. Johnston, McMaster University, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, Vol. 1, 1976; Vol. 2, 1981.

25. Ibid., Vol. 2, p. 3.

26. See Sidney E. Smith "Educational Structure: the English-Canadian Universities" in Claude T. Bissell ed., Canada's Crisis in Higher Education, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957, p. 8.

27. Claude Bissell, Halfway up Parnassus, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

28. Ibid., p. 9.

29. Charles M. Johnston, McMaster University, op. cit., Vol. 2, pp. 126-127.

30. Ibid., p. 128.

31. Ibid., p. 132.

32. Hilda Neatby, Queen's University, Vol. 1, 1841-1917, edited by Frederick W. Gibson and Roger Graham, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1978.

33. John R. W. Gwynne-Timothy, Western's First Century, London: The University of Western Ontario, 1978.

34. John S. Brubacher and Willis Rudy, Higher Education in Transition: An American History, 1636-1956, New York, N.Y.: Harper and Brothers, 1958, p. 205.

35. See University Government in Canada: Report of a Commission sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1966.

36. Stanley B. Frost, McGill University, 1801-1895, Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1980, Vol. 1.

37. Duncan D. Campbell, Those Tumultuous Years: The Goals of the President of the University of Alberta during the Decase of the 1960's, Edmonton: The University of Alberta, 1977, p. 3.

38. William M. Sibley, "Accountability and the University: "Is Whirl to be King?" in Stoa, Canadian Society for the study of higher Education II-2, 1972, p. 15.

39. See John Henry Cardinal Newman, The Idea of a University intro. by George N. Shuster, Garden City, N.Y.: Image (Doubleday) 1959.

40. Ibid., p. 27.

41. Ibid.

42. Matthew Arnold, "Dover Beach: Representative Poetry, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1938, Vol. II, p. 547.

43. Erich Heller, The Disinherited Mind, London, U.K.: Bowes and Bowes.

44. See Otto Butz, The Unsilent Generation, New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.

45. W. M. Sibley, "Modes of University Government" in The Canadian Journal of Higher Education VI-1, 1976, p. 22.

46. W. M. Sibley, "Institutional Accountability—Concept, Dogma, and Reality," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, IV-2, 1974, p. 70.

47. W. L. Morton, "The Evolution of University Government in Canada," The Canadian Forum, February 1962, p. 246.

48. See University Government in Canada: Report of the Commission Sponsored by the Canadian Association of University Teachers and the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, op. cit., p. 61.

49. Ibid., p. 62.

50. W. B. Cunningham, "Within or Without? The Location of the Faculty Association," C.A.U.T. Bulletin, December 1968, p. 37.

51. W. L. Morton, "The Evolution of University Government in Canada," op. cit., p. 247.

52. See Michael Horn, "Letters to the Editor," The Globe and Mail, 6 November 1976, p. 7.

53. Ibid.

54. Ibid.

55. W. B. Cunningham, "Within or Without?" op. cit., p. 37.

56. John R. Searle, The Campus War, Harmondsworth, U.K.: Penguin Books Ltd., 1972.

57. Ibid., p. 141.

58. W. M. Sibley, "Modes of University Government," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 1, 1976, p. 22.

59. Norman Angell, The Story of Money, Garden City, N.Y.: Garden City Publishing Co., 1929, p. 107.

60. Hilda Neatby, "Frustrated, Prejudiced, Partial, Biased and Undemocratic: Some Personal Reflections on the Predicament of our Universities" in Proceedings and Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Ottawa; Royal Society of Canada, 1972, p. 140.

61. J. Percy Smith, "What Matters Academic Freedom?" Stoa - Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education, Vol. 1-1 1971, p. 5.

62. Geoffrey Sawer, "Self-Government in Australian Universities," Science and Freedom, No. 6, Manchester, U.K.: Committee on Science and Freedom, 1956, p. 27.

63. Premier John Robarts, Statement in the Ontario Legislature, 21 March 1963.

64. The Globe and Mail, Toronto, Friday, 11 April 1975, p. 1.

65. Claude T. Bissell, "The Recovery of a Canadian Tradition in Higher Education," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, VII - 2, 1977, p. 4.

66. See B. L. Adell and D. D. Carter, Collective Bargaining for University Faculty in Canada, Kingston: Industrial Relations Centre, Queen's University, 1972; see also B. Adell, "The Legal Framework of Faculty Collective Bargaining: Some Short Questions and Some Long Answers," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, V - 2, 1975, pp. 57-75; see also D. D. Carter, "Collective Bargaining for University Faculty: A Legal Perspective," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, V-1, 1975, pp. 25-31.

67. John Maynard Keynes, Essays in Biography, London, U.K.: Mercury Books, Mercury Books, 1961, pp. 313-314.

68. Abraham H. Maslow, "The Creative Attitude," Eli Bornstein, ed., The Structurist, No. 3, 1963.

69. Ibid., p. 7.

70. C. P. Snow, The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution, The Rede Lecture, Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

71. Northrope Frye, "Where Metaphors and Equations Meet: a Convergence of the Arts and Sciences." The Chronicle of Higher Education, 13 April 1981, p. 64.

72. Larry J. Fisk, "Contributions to a Regenerated Social Science: A Review," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, VI - 2, 1976, pp. 29-36.

73. C. S. Belshaw, Towers Besieged: The Dilemma of the Creative University, Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1974.

74. J. M. Cameron, On the Idea of a University, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978.

75. J. M. Cameron, Ibid., p. xii.

76. Robert Burch, "Jaspers' Concept of the University," The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, VI - 3, 1976, pp. 13-41.

77. George Meredith, Modern Love, XLIII.